

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of August 1, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

The Office Action was lengthy, as well is this response. Applicants have made every effort to address every item in the Office Action. Should the Examiner not agree with any proposed language/remarks, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to discuss alternative language so as to advance prosecution.

### Election

The election of Species 2, subspecies 4, claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12-17 is confirmed. Claims 2, 5, 8, and 11 have been withdrawn and are canceled.

### Drawings

The drawings are objected to for various reasons discussed on pages 4-5 of the Office Action. Each objection has been addressed below and withdrawal of this objection is requested.

In regard to the endless track, claim 3 has been canceled hence this objection is moot.

In regard to item 34, this reference number indicates a side wall – it is not a blank space. This is similar to item 33 indicating a back wall and item 32 indicating a front wall. That is, the wall 34 shown is simply a flat rectangular side wall and one skilled in the art reading the passage that describes item 34 would understand that item 34 is a wall.

The width is identified in FIG 5 as  $w$ ; hence the width direction is along  $w$ . The passage at page 8, line 16, has been amended to clarify the width direction.

In regard to "... the free motion rotating body starts to make a rolling movement toward a direction as shown in FIG. 9...", it is respectfully submitted that this passage is clear. That is, FIG. 8 shows one position of the free motion rotating body and FIG. 9 shows a second position. The passage refers to the direction the body takes to move from the position in FIG. 8 to the

position in FIG. 9. One skilled in the art would understand the direction the body would need to move from one position to the next.

Item 3b is shown in Fig. 6.

### Specification

The specification is objected to for various reasons discussed on pages 6-7 of the Office Action. The specification has been amended to address the various objections.

### Claims

Claim 1 is objected to for various informalities for which the Examiner provides suggested alternative language. Claim 1 has been canceled and claim 4 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 1 and to address the informalities.

Claim 3 stands rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 3 and 15 are each rejected as not enabled. Claim 3 has been canceled rendering the rejections thereover moot. Claim 15 has been amended to eliminate the term "simplical". Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12-17 stand rejected as indefinite. Claims 4, 7, 10, and 13-17 have been amended, claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, and 11-12 have been canceled. It is believed that the amendments address the concerns set forth in this rejection.

In regard to new claim 18, the phrase "the free motion rotating body travels at half traveling speed of the object" is clear from the description. It means that as the object (such as a drawer) is pulled out, the body travels at a slower rate ( $\frac{1}{2}$  the rate) of the drawer so that even though the body is near the front of the drawer when the drawer is in a stored position, as the drawer is pulled out, the position of the body to the front of the drawer gets larger. This is illustrated if Fig. 3 is compared to Fig. 4. Fig. 3 is in a more closed position and the body is closer to the front of the drawer. Fig. 4 is in a more open position and the body is further away

from the front of the drawer. This is accomplished by having the traveling speed of the body be  $\frac{1}{2}$  that of the traveling speed of the drawer. The speed is relative to the floor.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 USC 101 as inoperative and lacking utility. Claim 3 has been canceled; hence the rejection is moot.

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 stand rejected as anticipated by Rapp (4,659,237). Claims 14 and 15 stand rejected as anticipated by, or obvious over, Rapp. Claim 13 stands rejected as unpatentable over Rapp. Claims 16 and 17 stand rejected as unpatentable over Rapp in view of Shapleigh (3,613,566).

Rapp discloses a concealed guide rail assembly that utilizes runner rollers 5'. These rollers are not suspended from the drawer through a rail and a rotor such that once the drawer is pulled out, the roller contacts both the underside of the drawer and the floor. Instead, the rollers move along a guide rail and stay elevated from the floor. Moreover, as can be seen in Fig. 5, friction occurs between the outer periphery of the runner rollers 5' and the inner periphery of the recess of the runner carriage 4. The higher the load the runner roller 5' must bear (e.g. from the weight of articles in the drawer), the higher the friction becomes. Such friction does not occur in the arrangement of the instant claims. Rapp does not teach or suggest the instant claims. Shapleigh does not remedy the defects of Rapp. Withdrawal of the instant rejection is requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 14, and 15 stand rejected as unpatentable over Onomoto (5,046,790) in view of Reaney (5,779,067). Claims 7 and 9 stand rejected as unpatentable over Onomoto in view of Reaney and Alreck (6,371,584). Claims 10 and 12 stand rejected as unpatentable over Onomoto in view of Reaney, Alreck, and Liang (6,457,790). Claim 13 stands rejected as unpatentable over Onomoto in view of Reaney.

Onomoto is directed to a movable cabinet that utilizes casters (items 3 and 4) to move the cabinet and movable leg members to immobilize the cabinet. Castors 4 are also used to pull the machine body from the cabinet after the cabinet is immobilized. Castors 4 remain on the floor at all times and are not suspended when the machine is replaced into the cabinet.

In addition the castors do not make have an upper end making an abutting contact with a downward facing surface of the machine. See Fig. 4 which clearly shows the wheel placement inside of the cabinet walls and outside the machine structure.

Reaney is directed to a vertical refrigerator slide rack with permanent wheels attached to the bottom of the rack. Reaney clearly does not remedy the defects of Onomoto. None of the remaining cited prior art cited for various dependent claim features remedy the defects of Onomoto. Withdrawal of the instant rejections is requested.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the instant rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are requested. If any additional fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.


Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated:

11/1/06

By:

  
Susan A. Wolffe  
Registration No. 33,568

1001 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001  
SAW